

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RECEIVED

SEP 0 5 2003

In re application of

Confirmation N . 9667

TC 1700

Ingvar SELMER-OLSEN et al.

Docket No. 2001-0136A

Serial No. 09/762,821

Group Art Unit 1761

Filed April 23, 2001

Examiner Carolyn A. Paden

AQUEOUS PRESERVATIVE

RESPONSE

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE FEE FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975.

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of June 6, 2003, Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these remarks.

Initially, although the Office Action Summary page indicates that claims 5-13 are pending in the application, please note that the previous Office Action indicates that claims 4-12 are pending, and Applicants' response to the previous Office Action notes that the claims under examination are claims 5-12 set forth in the Preliminary Amendment. It therefore appears that the claims pending in the application are claims 5-12.

The rejection of claims 5, 6, 8 and 10-13 (10-12?) under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of Hjornevik et al. in view of Haram is respectfully traversed.